IN THE UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

Atty. Docket: STOPPELMANN=1

In re Application of:

(Conf. No.: 6941

(Conf. No.: 69

REPLY TO RESTRICTION REQUIREMENT

Honorable Commissioner for Patents U.S. Patent and Trademark Office Randolph Building, Mail Stop Amendments 401 Dulany Street Alexandria, VA 22314

Sir:

The applicants hereby acknowledge the oral restriction requirement by telephone and receipt of the subsequent Office Action mailed July 10, 2008, to which applicants reply below.

First, however, acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers under Section 119 would be appreciated.

Restriction has been required between what is considered by the PTO to be two (2) separate inventions, presumably patentably distinct from one another. As applicants must make an election even though the requirement is traversed, applicants hereby respectfully and provisionally elect Group I, presently claims 1-8, 13 and 14, with traverse and without prejudice.

Appln. No. 10/526,767 Amd. dated August 7, 2008 Office Action dated: July 10, 2008

The Office Action indicates that unity of invention is destroyed by Kumaki EP 0863180. Applicants do not necessarily agree; however, even if Kumaki covers the broadest subject matter presently claimed, respectfully not admitted, there is still common subject matter between the two groups in claims of narrower scope, whereby the claims of the present application still meet the requirements of PCT Rules 13.1 and 13.2 by sharing a common technical feature linking the claims.

Accordingly applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the requirement and examination of all the claims on the merits.

Applicants now respectfully await the results of a first examination on the merits.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.

Attorneys for Applicant

Ву

Sheridan Neimark

Registration No. 20,520

SN:jnj

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197 Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528

F:\itt1\winFORMS\AMDFRMNEW.doc